

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 5-29 and 36-38 are pending in this application.

Claims 1, 15 and 38 have been amended by the present Amendment. Amended claims 1, 15 and 38 do not introduce any new subject matter.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-2, 5-29 and 36-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2003/0226148 ("Ferguson") in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0149708 ("Nagata"), and U.S. Patent No. 6,724,317 ("Kitano").

Reconsideration is also respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson in view of Nagata.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, when taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the controls for controlling functions of the media player that are positioned on the door and accessible by a user when the door is in a closed position, as recited in amended claims 1 and 15. Further, the cited references, when taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest (1) the controls that are positioned on the door; and (2) the display that faces a user, and the controls that are accessible by the user when the door is in the closed position, as recited in amended claim 38.

For example, Applicant's disclosure describes and shows hood 400 including a display 420 and controls 706 for controlling functions of the media player positioned on the door 402, whereby, when the door 402 is in the closed position, the display faces a user and the controls are accessible by the user. See, e.g., Applicant's disclosure, Fig.

6A.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, none of the cited references disclose or suggest controls for controlling functions of the media player positioned on a door. Further, none of the cited references, when taken alone, or in combination, disclose the display that faces a user and the controls that are accessible by the user when the door is in the closed position.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant maintains that amended claims 1, 15 and 38 are patentable over the cited references.

For at least the reason that claims 2, 5-14 and 36 depend from claim 1, and claims 16-29 and 37 depend from claim 15, claims 2, 5-14, 16-29 and 36-37 are also submitted to be patentable over the cited references.

As such, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 2, 5-29 and 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

Applicant has not independently addressed the rejections of all the dependent claims because Applicant submits that, in view of the amendments to the claims presented herein and, for at least similar reasons as why the independent claims from which the dependent claims depend are believed allowable as discussed, *supra*, the dependent claims are also allowable. Applicant however, reserves the right to address any individual rejections of the dependent claims should such be necessary or appropriate.

An early and favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, the Examiner may telephone Applicant's Attorney to reach a prompt disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael F. Morano
Reg. No. 44,952
Attorney for Applicant

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11797
(516) 692-8888